



- (1) Ajit Pai scheduled the comment period on MB 05-311 just before Christmas 2018 to make sure as few as people as possible would have the opportunity to comment on his proposed change in the FCC rules. This is illegal, anti-democratic, and against public policy.
- (2) Ajit Pai used to work for Verizon, and Verizon would benefit from this rule change. He is therefore advocating for Verizon and not for the people of this great country. Pai is violating an appearance of fairness by advocating this change in FCC rules. It is a conflict of interest for him to propose rules which would benefit Verizon and other corporations (at the expense of local governments and people who live in rural areas, as well as the American public).
- (3) The last time anyone tried to end public TV was in 1969, when President Richard Nixon tried to stop the funding for public TV. That initiative was stopped and Nixon was later impeached. As with Nixon, both Ajit Pai and Michael O'Rielly should be impeached and/or removed from office, because they do not care about the public who they are supposed to serve. They don't hold the same democratic values of most Americans.
- (4) Both Ajit Pai and Michael O'Rielly want to subsidize Comcast and Verizon and other companies so they can make even more money. It's apparently not enough to Pai and O'Rielly that these companies make trillions of dollars a year – the American people deserve better treatment.
- (5) Both Pai and O'Rielly are trying to make law, or legislate by changing these FCC rules – this is illegal, and they should be stopped.
- (6) Are Pai and O'Rielly receiving any bribes or financial payoffs for trying to change these FCC regulations? If so, their bank accounts and all of their financial assets should be audited to make sure that they are not being bribed by Verizon, Comcast, or any other corporate entities.
- (7) Ajit Pai and Michael O'Rielly have made sure very few people knew of this proposed rule change, so no one would comment. As one example, not one word of this has been in the mass media in the U.S., because ABC, NBC, CBS, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and FOX all want to destroy Public TV. As David Rockefeller said: "We are grateful to *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *Time Magazine*, and other great publications whose directors have attended our (Bilderberger secret) meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost forty years. It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subject to the lights of publicity

during those years. But, the world is now more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to ... ("democracy") practiced in past centuries (in the United States)." See: <https://www.crossroad.to/Quotes/globalism/rockefeller.htm>

(8) Franchise fees as they have been collected and directed since 2005, to support the local channels, operations, & equipment managed by local media centers throughout the United States. The monies have been well spent and have directly benefitted cable TV subscribers, residents, public schools, and many local governments. Adoption of the new rulemaking by the FCC will harm communities throughout the United States; it will likely result in destroying a critical and robust public telecommunications infrastructure upon which many people depend (including 911 emergency services in many rural communities for fire and police protection, because the implementation of these new rules will also take away funding for police and fire services).

(9) Why should we subsidize Comcast and Verizon? Why should we let them destroy Public TV, and harm the American people?

(10) I support Public TV and want it to continue. I strongly disapprove of FCC's MB 05-311 recommendations to give companies like Comcast and Verizon a deduction for "in-kind" contributions.